Leeds Studies in English

Pope Sergius I's Privilege for Malmesbury

Christine Rauer

Not many books survive from the earliest library at Malmesbury, although some of its contents can be inferred from the reading of one of Malmesbury's most interesting figures, the early abbot and Anglo-Latin author Aldhelm (d. c. 709 or 710).[1] In the late seventh or early eighth century Aldhelm appears to have travelled to Rome, possibly to obtain privileges from Pope Sergius I (s. 687-701) for two English monasteries over which he presided: Malmesbury, and an unnamed institution in the neighbourhood dedicated to St John.[2] Sergius is known to have had other connections with England: it was Sergius who baptized Cædwalla (689),[3] gave the pallium to Archbishop Berhtwald of Canterbury (693),[4] and consecrated Willibrord as Archbishop of the Frisians (695);[5] he also seems to have confirmed a privilege for the monastery at Wearmouth,[6] and perhaps even arbitrated in the disputes between Bishop Wilfrid of York and Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury.[7]

On the occasion of Aldhelm's visit, Sergius may well have obliged his petitions with a privilege, and it is the resulting Latin text and its relationship with an Old English version which will be at the centre of this discussion. The bull handed over to Aldhelm (if indeed issued), is unsurprisingly lost. Three late medieval cartularies, however, claim to preserve its text:[8] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood empt. 5, fols 57^r-60^r (s. xiii$^{in.}$), London, Public Record Office, E 164/24, fols 140^v-41^v (s. xiii), and London, British Library, Lansdowne 417, fols 35^r-36^v (s. xiv/xv).[9] The text also survives embedded in two works by William of Malmesbury: his edition of the *Liber pontificalis*[10] and his *Gesta pontificum* where it was inserted by William himself, as is apparent from his autograph, Oxford, Magdalen College 172, fols 86^v-87^v (s. xii^1).[11] Finally, an early modern transcript was made by John Joscelyn, secretary to Archbishop Parker, in the margins of London, British Library, Cotton Otho C. i, part I, fols 68^r-69^v (s. xvi).[12] The

medieval Latin versions can be said to differ only in minor details, and the version preserved in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood empt. 5 seems to be closest to the text's archetype.[13] There then survives an Old English version of the Latin privilege, preserved only in London, British Library, Cotton Otho C.i, part I, fols. 68r-69v (s. xi[med.] prov. Malmesbury?), one of the manuscripts badly damaged in the fire of 1731.[14] The Latin and Old English texts of Sergius's privilege are similar in structure, consisting of a Superscription, Preamble (on the nature of privileges, sections [1-2]), Disposition (describing the parties involved, the requested privileges and conditions, the confirmation and details of the privilege and disclaimers, [3-10]), and the Final Protocol (penal clause and salutation [10-11]).[15] A witness list [12] which only survives in the vernacular text probably existed in the Latin version too;[16] the dating clause is missing from both versions. Among the surviving Latin versions, that closest to the Old English is again Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood empt. 5.

It is clear that no papal bull would have been issued in Old English, and that any vernacular version of such a text would necessarily have to be a translation. The most basic scenario suggesting itself, therefore, would be a relatively long transmission of the Latin text ending in the surviving Latin versions, with a derivative vernacular tradition. Given that papal documents are often known to have experienced interpolations, rewritings and other tampering, however, a more complex scenario is theoretically plausible.[17] Heather Edwards, the most recent editor of Sergius's text, indeed proposed a more complicated relationship: according to Edwards, the vernacular version represents a translation from an older, lost Latin tradition; the surviving Latin versions are said to be direct descendants not of Sergius's bull, but of a later *retranslation* into Latin from Old English.[18] Accordingly, the transmission of the Latin text would have come to an end within the early medieval period, with loss of all Latin copies, thus necessitating a retranslation from Old English for the reproduction of a new Latin text. The surviving Latin versions would therefore be descended from the vernacular tradition, via a process of translation from Latin into Old English and retranslation into Latin. As a possible setting, Edwards pointed to late eleventh-century Malmesbury, whose monastic personnel, dismayed at the lack of written information on the early history of their abbey, are known to have invited the Italian monk Faricius of Arezzo (d. 1117) to fill the gap by composing the notoriously fanciful *Vita S. Aldhelmi*.[19] Faricius's English is known to have been poor,[20] and would likely have caused problems in his collection of vernacular material. Edwards suggested that a need would thus have arisen to recreate a

Latin text, if it had by then been lost, by or on behalf of Faricius: 'It seems likely that the Old English sources used for his *Life of Aldhelm* were translated for him by an assistant, himself perhaps a person of Norman origin and not entirely fluent in English'.[21] Surveying previous opinions on the authenticity of Sergius's text, Edwards referred to David Knowles, Michael Lapidge and Michael Herren as 'the only scholars to have published an opinion of this particular document'.[22] The latter two interpreted the surviving Latin versions as spurious, an impression which would indeed fit a theory of the Latin text as a product of translation and retranslation.[23]

On closer inspection, however, the case could well be different. In what follows, I would like to propose an alternative scenario for the relationship between the Latin and vernacular branches of transmission; in particular, it should be possible to show that the surviving Latin tradition is unlikely to have issued from the vernacular, and that the most basic imaginable transmission, namely that of an older Latin tradition (genuine or spurious), with a derivative Old English text, could after all be the more convincing hypothesis. Modern reactions to Sergius's privilege are in any case more extensive and varied than has been suggested. It is true that some commentators have in the past referred to the text as spurious, in all cases without discussion or supporting evidence.[24] Others have variously interpreted the text as authentic (wholly or partially), probably authentic, or requiring further examination.[25] The most detailed examination of the literary sources of Sergius's privilege is that by Hans Hubert Anton, who describes the document's authenticity as 'largely accepted', assessing the surviving Latin versions as 'unambiguously genuine' and as presenting substantially the same text as that which was presumably issued by Pope Sergius.[26] Anton's argument is mainly based on stylistic comparison. Sergius's privilege is shown to present extensive verbal parallels with three other privileges: John VII for Farfa (JE 2144), Agatho for Chertsey (JE 2115) and Constantine I for Bermondsey and Woking (JE 2148), above all in the sections dealing with monastic exemption [7], the celebration of masses [8], abbatial and presbyterial elections [9-10], and in the exhortation [10-11]. The parallel phrasing in this group of documents seems to indicate literary influence from a common source or group of closely related sources – possibly an early version or precursor of the *Liber diurnus*, the much debated formulary of the papal chancery – and Anton goes as far as to use the parallels between this group of exemptions and *Liber diurnus*-material as an indicator of the probable authenticity of the privileges.[27]

An important question is, therefore, whether a Latin text which has experienced translation into, and subsequent retranslation out of, Old English would still present a sufficient level of verbal parallel with a group of highly formulaic papal documents, and display the characteristics of authentic papal diplomatic, as outlined by Anton. If not, it is clear that the parallels between the privileges for Malmesbury, Farfa, Chertsey, Bermondsey and Woking and their purported source constitute an obstacle for a theory involving a recreation of the Latin privilege for Malmesbury from a vernacular source, especially so as Anton argues against a direct relationship between the four privileges. Sergius's privilege appeared sufficiently authentic to persuade several medieval popes who issued confirmations, starting with Innocent II (1142).[28] Around the same time, the Malmesbury community presented their case for free abbatial election, equally basing it on the privilege of Sergius.[29] Moreover, while working on his *Gesta pontificum*, William of Malmesbury is likely to have used a Latin, not vernacular, exemplar, probably a close relative of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood empt. 5.[30] At least around the mid-twelfth century, therefore, a further Latin text, now lost, seems to have been in circulation which appeared convincing to the papal chancery and personnel at Malmesbury.

Closer analysis of the vernacular and Latin texts shows up characteristic divergence. Two points of differing content were pointed out by Edwards: the witness list which survives only in the Old English version, and the conflicting information on the origin of the place-name of Malmesbury.[31] According to William of Malmesbury, Aldhelm was educated by a learned Irish hermit variously known as Maildubus, Maelduin or Maelduibh, allegedly the first abbot of Malmesbury whose name may also be preserved in the place-name.[32] Although reference to this elusive figure seems to be made in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* ('[monasterium], quod Maildubi Vrbem nuncupant'), it remains unclear whether he should be regarded as historical, fictitious, or a conflation with a historical figure.[33] The Latin version of Sergius's privilege does refer to this figure: 'monasterium beatorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli, quod Meldum religiosae memoriae condidit, quod etiam nunc Meldumesburg uocatur' ('the monastery of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, founded by Meldum of religious memory and still called Meldumesburg (Malmesbury)', [3]). The corresponding vernacular phrase, by contrast, seems to present 'Meldum' as a place-name: 'þæt mynster þæt is sancte Petre and sancte Paule gehalgud, on þam mæran gemynde, gelogud æt Meldum, þæt is oþrum naman Maldumesburuh geclypud' ('the monastery which is

consecrated to St Peter and St Paul, of famous memory, established ?at Meldum, which is alternatively called Maldum's Burgh (Malmesbury)' [3]).

Edwards regarded the Old English passage as 'obscure' and assumed anteriority, suggesting that the fabrication of the fabulous Malduibh in the Latin version should be attributed to the eleventh century.[34] But it seems to me that this conclusion is not inevitable. Bede does hint at earlier ideas of an Irish founder figure. The vernacular passage too makes reference to this founder in the place-name 'Maldumesburuh' which seems sufficiently transparent to suggest a masculine figure of 'Maldum', and also happens to correspond exactly to Bede's term. It is therefore important to stress that, like the Latin version, the Old English passage *also* refers to a person named Maldum. Moreover, late usage of Old English 'æt' admits the translation of 'gelogud æt Meldum' as 'established *by* Meldum', thus again referring to a person rather than a place.[35] Interestingly, in other texts this usage of 'æt' seems to be mainly Ælfrician.[36]

It is true that this interpretation would also leave the subsequent reference to 'oþrum naman' unexplained, which points to two synonymous place-names. The phrase 'oþrum naman' also presents problems, however, as it is clearly at odds with the Latin equivalent 'etiam', here to be understood in a temporal sense, as 'still, even now, to this day'. It is possible that a translator may have misunderstood the Latin 'etiam' to indicate synonymity, leading to a translation as the more specific 'oþrum naman'; that a retranslator extrapolated the more ambiguous 'etiam' from a reference as precise as the Old English one seems less convincing. But it is also interesting that a place-name 'Maldum', without '-burh' or a similar compound element or suffix, would be unique, again hinting that 'æt Maldum' does refer to a person rather than a place.

The context of the phrase 'of religious memory' is also difficult, apparently making more sense in the Latin text, where it refers to a person ('Meldum religiosae memoriae', now deceased but surviving in pious memory), and where it represents one of many attestations of precisely this construction.[37] In Old English, by comparison, the phrase 'on þam mæran gemynde' awkwardly and syntactically ambiguous attaches itself to either St Peter and Paul (meaningfully, but at odds with the Latin version), or, at greater distance, to 'Meldum' (which only makes sense if 'Meldum' is understood as a personal name, not a place-name).[38] Curiously, 'on þam mæran gemynde' seems to have no parallels or near-parallels in Old English, with reference to persons or places or otherwise. The entire passage concerning the foundation of Malmesbury seems to be more problematic in Old English than in Latin, appearing to be either unidiomatic, or

corrupt, or both, in the vernacular version. Again it may be easier to assume that the conventional phrasing of the Latin reflects the authenticity of that text, rather than that a retranslator managed to extract meaning from a garbled vernacular passage.

The stylistic differences between the vernacular and Latin texts are numerous. The former consistently provides greater amounts of commentary, explaining, for instance, the papal status of Sergius ('papa' [1]), which compares with the formulaic 'seruus seruuorum Dei' ([1]). The vernacular version specifies the monastery, Malmesbury, at the opening of the text, whereas the Latin superscription more vaguely mentions the addressees' 'uenerabili uestro monasterio' ([1]). When the Latin text threatens with the suffering of Judas Iscariot, the vernacular expands on the reason for his suffering ('ures drihtnes hælendes Cristes belæwend' [11]), a phrase which has parallels and near-parallels in late Anglo-Saxon diplomatic.[39] The vernacular text also elucidates the relationship between Ananias and Sapphira ('his wif' [11]), and adds additional warnings to the Latin penal clause, namely being 'to bælue and to ecere yrmþe efre geteald and betæht' ([11]). Where the Latin recommends that the clerics concern themselves with the 'inner man', the vernacular expands with 'þæt is seo saul' ([6]); similarly, where the Latin has 'the outer man', the vernacular passage seems to explain that the body is meant (partially legible [6]). This equation of the 'inner man' with the soul is also paralleled elsewhere in Anglo-Saxon literature, most closely again in Ælfrician texts.[40]

Some passages are conversely preserved in the Latin but not in the vernacular text. A reference which in the Latin recommends 'seculares curas et questus effugere' ([5]) is missing from the vernacular, as is a phrase about exercising abstinence as a means of bodily purification ('abstinentiam tamquam purificationem corporis in cunctis uitae studiis adhibere' [5]), and a passage about protection from bodily infection and harmful words and thoughts ('immaculatos sese uos non solum a contagione carnali, sed etiam a sermonibus noxiis et cogitationibus custodire' [6]). Interestingly, the vernacular also lacks a passage on extorting presents from the holy congregation ('munuscula a religiosa congregatione extorquere uel exposcere' [8]) and the detail concerning ordination without remuneration ('absque muneris datione ordinante' [9]).[41]

Other stylistic divergences are apparent, with the vernacular gesturing towards homiletic diction: besides the eschatological warnings and biblical 'footnotes' [11] referred to above, the vernacular also addresses the bull's recipients as 'brothers' twice more often than the Latin ('eow gebroþru' [4], 'and nu ge gebroþru' [10]). It is only the Old English text which observes that death

has a levelling effect on mankind ('þæt is eallum mannum gemæne' [9]). Occasionally the Old English syntax seems to have been simplified by breaking up a particularly long sequence of subordinate clauses [3, 4]. Another difference consists in the ubiquitous synonymous doublets in the vernacular. This relatively short text contains nine examples where two synonymous Old English terms correspond to one Latin one: compare 'conferuntur' [1] and 'tobrohte and togyfene' [1]; 'licentia' [1] and 'are and æhte' [1]; 'religione uestra' [3] and 'eower eadmodnyss and eower æwfæstnyss' [3]; 'impares' [3] and 'unwyr<þ>e and ungelice' [3]; 'decernimus' and 'gedemað and gesettað' [7]; 'dispensare' [3] and 'wissudest and dihtest' [3]; 'hortamur' [4] and 'mynegiaþ ([. . .]) and halsiaþ' [4]; 'profitientes' (or 'perfitientes' in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood empt. 5) [6] and 'hicgende æfre and þeonde' [6]; 'munienda' [7] and 'to bewerigende and to (g[. . .])' [7]. These doublets are frequently found in Old English prose, particularly in homiletic writings, where they constitute a mannerism of particular authors, especially Wulfstan.[42] Here, they serve to create a distinctively vernacular impression, contributing to the moralizing tone of the privilege. Several of the doublets used in the vernacular version of Sergius's privilege are attested elsewhere: 'gedemað and gesettað' [7] occurs in the Old English *Bede*.[43] The collocation of 'ar' and 'æhte' [1] has parallels in a law-code and two wills, where, however, it seems to refer to estates and (movable) possessions, conflicting with the equivalent in Sergius's privilege ('libera uiuendi facultate', 'frigre are and æhte to libbenne').[44] In this case too, it seems unlikely that the more general Latin reference could have been derived from the narrow, quasi-formulaic Old English phrase of a different meaning. Like the idiomatically extended references to Judas, these two doublets would suggest that an attempt was made to cast the vernacular version in a diplomatic idiom.

The parallels with homiletic style, such as the use of alliteration and rhyme (particularly alliterative doublets), the eschatological interests of the vernacular author, the emphatic address of the audience as 'brothers', possible usage of Ælfrician 'æt', and the reference to the soul as the 'inner man' become still more interesting in view of similarities with the translation of an Ely privilege, whose characteristic diction allowed John Pope to attribute it to Ælfric.[45] Whereas the parallels between the Ely privilege and Ælfric's writings are very distinctive (ranging from close specific parallels in use of rhythm, vocabulary, literary sources, alliteration, rhyme, and paronomasia), the homiletic echoes in Sergius' privilege seem in my view to be not extensive and not characteristically Ælfrician enough to make attribution to this author straightforward. Whether it was now

Ælfric who was involved in the translation of Sergius's bull, or another author steeped in homiletic style, the accumulated weight of both the Ely and Malmesbury privileges in any case points to a pattern of homilist authorship for translation of Latin diplomatic into Old English.

To sum up, the Latin text represents a more or less formulaic document, with all the hypotactic complexities and technical vocabulary one might expect, contrasting with a vernacular version which has been annotated and simplified to such an extent that the text leaves little unclear to a reader unfamiliar with papal diplomatic. At the same time, the Old English text displays a distinctively vernacular, diplomatic, quasi-homiletic idiom. Should the surviving Latin versions derive from a retranslation from Old English, the retranslator would have been required to strip the vernacular text of precisely all these footnotes, homiletic idiosyncrasies, vernacular diplomatic diction and a great deal of additional information, to arrive at what is present in the surviving Latin text. This seems less likely to me than the reverse, namely that the wording of the surviving Latin text represents the source, not the derivative, of the vernacular text. No anglicisms have been detected in the Latin text which would indicate more clearly a transmission through an Old English stage. By contrast, the vernacular version contains what looks like a mistranslation of 'munus' [2], here in this context misunderstood as 'gift' (OE 'gærsum', 'treasure', instead of 'responsibility').[46] Another misunderstanding seems to have occurred in section [3], which refers to the pious devotion of the pope in the Latin version, but to that of the addressees in the vernacular. The lacunae caused by fire-damage to the manuscript make comprehension particularly difficult in sections [1], [3], and [6], but the vernacular version also seems to be textually corrupt, for instance in the description of the two monasteries [3], or the election of priests and abbots [9]; the corresponding Latin passages, by contrast, come across as grammatical, if complex.[47] These textual difficulties, together with the apparent solecisms of 'on þam mæran gemynde' [3], 'are and æhte' [1], and 'oþrum naman' [3] discussed above, all with unproblematic Latin counterparts of a different meaning, indicate that the surviving Latin versions are unlikely to have issued from the Old English text.

What would seem to be more likely, therefore, is that a text similar to Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood empt. 5 was turned into an idiosyncratic Old English text of a distinctly 'vernacularized' style and content, a process which can be observed in dozens of texts based on Latin sources.[48] It is more difficult to find examples of the reverse process – corrective retranslation from Old English into Latin – although Edwards was right in pointing to the interesting case of a

privilege by Leo III (JE 2497), which was indeed translated into Old English with subsequent retranslation into Latin by William of Malmesbury.[49] But that case differs from Sergius's privilege as William explicitly comments on his retranslation, apologetically as it were, as a deviation from his normal working practice;[50] it is important to note that he gives no such source reference for the privilege for Malmesbury. On the contrary, the impression is that here William is editing a superior Latin exemplar, a close relative of which, moreover, survives in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood empt. 5. William's retranslation of Leo's privilege could only with difficulty be regarded as an authentic papal document.[51]

One of the larger issues addressed here, then, is that of 'authenticity', undoubtedly a difficult concept in papal diplomatic. Having considered translation into and retranslation from Old English, Edwards concluded, paradoxically, that the surviving Latin text of Sergius's privilege may well be 'authentic' and 'part of a valuable corpus of evidence for the history of the early West Saxon kingdom'.[52] I would suggest that a retranslation hypothesis would rule out 'authenticity', whatever its definition, since translation-cum-retranslation between different languages and registers tends to involve far greater levels of textual interference than would be at work during a more normal process of transmission. If retranslation is not convincing, two possibilities remain: the Latin version of Sergius's privilege could be directly transmitted and therefore authentic, either wholly or partially, or else could constitute a sophisticated forgery.

The parallels between the privilege of Sergius and other monastic exemptions analysed by Anton show that the surviving Latin text cannot have been newly produced with recourse to the surviving Old English text alone. Any later recreation of the Latin text, if that is what took place, would therefore have involved a complex, conscious forgery of the text, with close reference to various other papal privileges as well as *Liber diurnus*-related material, with simultaneous usage of the Old English text for content, a procedure for which no argument has yet been made.[53] Forgeries of papal privileges are known to have been produced in large numbers, particularly in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[54] But not every papal document claiming to date back to earlier centuries is therefore automatically a forgery. It seems to me that, at the current state of research, Pope Sergius's privilege presents few characteristics which could be seen as indicative of a forgery in the extreme sense; that is, an entirely recreated document. That does not mean that falsification, systematic or partial, can be ruled out altogether in the Latin text which is so clearly linked with a vast number of other papal privileges still under examination for their authenticity. Meanwhile, many other

indications appear to point to the alternative scenario already argued by Anton; namely that the text which claims to be Pope Sergius's privilege is authentic in the sense of representing a directly transmitted Latin text (admittedly with corruptions) whose seventh- or eighth-century phraseology is substantially preserved in the surviving Latin versions.[55]

The text below represents a new critical edition of the Old English version of Sergius's Privilege for Malmesbury. The manuscript (L) is badly damaged by fire, and the resulting lacunae have been left largely unemended by previous editors.[56] Partly through systematic comparison with the Latin text, and by appending a section of textual notes, my edition attempts the restoration of some of these passages. A manuscript line missed by Edwards is restored here; I have also corrected a number of misreadings and typographical errors, and have introduced punctuation and modern word division. Deviations from Edwards's edition (E) are systematically signalled in the critical apparatus. Angular brackets indicate emendations of shorter lacunae or textual difficulties, parentheses denote passages which are difficult to read; brackets denote passages which are entirely illegible; longer defective passages are discussed in the textual notes. Material which has no equivalent in the Latin is underlined. Irregular spellings are not standardized, but I have silently expanded abbreviations and introduced capitalization. Some emendations first suggested by Hamilton, ed., William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum*, pp. 371-72 n., are flagged as (H) in the textual notes; suggestions which I owe to personal communication with M. Winterbottom (W) are also acknowledged. My translation of the Old English text can be found at http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/english/rauer/Sergius.htm.

Sigla

L   London, British Library, Cotton Otho C. i, part I, fols 68ʳ-69ᵛ.
E   H. Edwards, 'Two Documents', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 59 (1986), 1-19 (pp. 16-17).

Text

[1] [68r] Sergius papa, Godes þeowa þeow, Aldhelm<e>, ([. . .]) Mealdumesbyrig[a] and his æfterfyligendum and þur<h> ([. . .]) arwyrðum mynstre, æwfulre drohtnunge ([. . .]), Godes þeowum. Þa þincg þe ða<m>[b] synd tobrohte <u>and togyfene</u> ([. . .]) frigre are <u>and æhte</u> to libbenne, na for luðre gelæfed<nesse>[c], ac for geornfulnesse wel to droht<nienne>[d] and on G<odes>[e] þeowdomum hi sylfe þa munecas mid syndrigre gewi<lnun>ge[f] to þeowigienne buton ælcum twyn, beon hi<m>[g] generude fram bisceopum and Godes biggencgerum þa ðe Godes lage began scylon, [2] þæt hi þ([. . .]) alysede fram bende <u>ælces</u> mennissces domes, eallswa [g]hi s<ynd>[h] fram ælcere gærsuman woruldlicra brucincga gewor<dene> clæne and unmæne, eallswa hyra munucbehat[i] and hyra ([. . .]) him cyþ, þæt hi Gode hi sylfe geæmtigean and his sylfes þeowdome beon atihte, for þæs mycelan mægenþrymmes arwyrþnysse hi synd gefreode na þæt an <fram> woruldlicra doma hefitemum byrþenum, ac eac swylce beon hi wyrþe þæs mæstan wyrþscipes for þære rihtre regules lufan. [3] Þanon eower eadmodnyss <u>and eower æwfæstnyss</u> us bitt þæt we scylon getrymman mid apostolicum sunderfreodomum[j] þæt mynster þæt is sancte Petre and sancte Paule gehalgud, on þam mæran gemynde, gelogud æt Meldum, þæt is oþrum naman Maldumesburuh[k] geclypud, gesett [68v] and aræred on Angelsexena scire, and eac oþer mynster <þæt> is aræred on þære ylcan scire wiþ þa ea þeo is geclypud Fron <and> on wyrþscipe þæs mæran fulluhteres Iohannis is ([. . .]). Þis we[l] doþ for ure ealdres lufe sancte Petres þa<m> ([. . .]d) and ure

---

[a] Mealdumesbyrig] Mealdumes byrig E

[b] ða<m>] ðar E, L

[c] gelæfed<nesse>] gelæredre ([. . .]) E

[d] droht<nienne>] drohtinge E

[e] on G<odes>] (ong[. . .]) E

[f] gewi<lnun>ge] (gewi[. . .]ge) E

[g] hi<m>] hi E

[h] hi s<ynd>] his([. . .]) E

[i] munucbehat] munuc behat E

[j] sunderfreodomum] sunderfreodumum E

[k] Maldumesburuh] Maldumes buruh E

[l] we] þe E

alysend hælend Crist gemedemude (be[. . .]ægan) to gewriþenne and to unbindenne on heofenan ([. . .]), <þ>æs ðenunge and ciricean we eac brucaþ and Gode <ge>medemigendum^m geendebyrdaþ^n and dihtaþ þeah þe we unwyr<þ>e^o and ungelice synd. Be þisum forespecenum cyricum we (hab[. . .]rnud) and manegra soþan^p race gehyred þe to us ([. . .]on) þæt ðu him foregleawlice^q and wislice wissudest and dihtest ([. . .]). We þæs wel uþon eowre estfulre^r eadmodnysse to eowrum willan. [4] We mynegiaþ eow gebroþru and halsiaþ þæt ge beon on Godes lofum carfulle and on gebedum þurhwacule, on forhæfednysse and on clænnysse fæsthafule and onclyfigende^s, cumliþnysse and manscipes weldædum beon underþeodde, hyrsumnysse and Cristes eadmodnysse þurhwunian æfre lufigendras and eow eall abutan mid þære arfæstre soþre lufe anræde, gastlicum bebodum and haligra yldrena regulum to þeowigenne, and þæs apostolices geleafan rihtincge ungewemmedlice gehealdan, [5] godum biggencgum simble to geæmtigean, manscipe gyfan^t beþearfendum^u and ælþeodigum, Godes cyricena bisceopum and mæssepreostum arwyrðnysse gegearwian swa hi hit geearnian, Gode æfre geæmtigean, gemedemunge and þearflicnysse lufian, on sealmum and on gastlicum ymnum ^vand on singalum [69r] gebedum on eallum Godes bebodum eow gemænelice awreccan^v. [6] And beoþ hicgende æfre and þeonde fram beteran to beteran and huru on eornust, þæt ge beon carfulle embe eowre saule þearfe, and simble t<r>uwian^w on Godes fultum, eow ([. . .]) ungewemmede, þæt clænnyss and sidefulnys eowres lichaman and saule ([. . .]) ætforan^x Godes eagan, þæt se inra mann, þæt is seo saul, (s[. . .]) mid mihte Godes gyfe and eac se uttra, þæt is se ([. . .]a) li<chama>,

---

^m   <ge>medemigendum] ([. . .]) medemigendum E

^n   geendebyrdaþ] ge endebyrdaþ E

^o   unwyr<þ>e] unwyr([. . .])e E

^p   soþan] soþra E, L

^q   foregleawlice] fore gleawlice E

^r   estfulre] est fulre E

^s   onclyfigende] on clyfigende E

^t   gyfan] gifan E

^u   beþearfendum] be þearfendum E

^v…v   and on singalum gebedum on eallum Godes bebodum eow gemænelice awreccan] *om.* E

^w   truwian] tsuwian L, E

^x   ætforan] æt foran E

begyte lof goddre drohtnunge and godes hlisan. [7] On eorn<ust> we gedemað <u>and gesettað</u> mid andweardum apostolicum sunderfreodomum beon to bewerigende <u>and to (g[. . .])</u> þas foresædan and arwyrþan mynstru, for þi þe ([. . .]nað) and beon sceal ure bisceoplicre gyfe weldæd þylcum Godes freondum þe hi<s> < h>us^y healdaþ, swa we gefyrn on embespæcon, þæt hi under rihtum dome and bewerunge þæs sylfan þe we þeowiað, ures aldres þæs eadigan Petres apostoles, and his haligan cyricean þære we dihtniað, eallswa þin godnyss and þin æwfæstnyss us bæd, þær^z scel þurhwunian mid Godes fultume and mid sancte Petres nu and on ecnysse. [8] Na hi næfre na gyrnan nanne, oððe bisceopa oþþe sacerda oþþe ænigra cyricli<c>re^{aa} endebyrdnysse preost, na hi huru þinga^{bb} na gesetten nanne bisceopstol innon hyra cyricean oððe furþon^{cc} þær lætan þæne bisceop mæssan singan, butan gyf he þyder cymð gelaþud of þam abbude and þære geferræddenne. [9] Gyf hi neode habbað to halgigenne enigne mæssepreost oþþe diacon for mæssena neode, and þæt buton ælcum tweon, halgie <he> buton ælcum [69v] scette under Godes dome, swa swa ealle^{dd} þincg to þam haligan regule belimpan. Gyf þæt getimie <u>þæt is eallum mannum gemæne</u> þæt se abbud gewite of þissum life and hit cume þærto, þæt <he beo>^{ee} cyres wyrþe, na awende man næfre of þære ([. . .]g[. . .]g) gegaderunge gemænum geþeahte, þæt þæne þe hi <ceos>að of Godes þeowum si þæt stedefæst þæt nan lyre^{ff} <u>oððe ([. . .]est)</u> na cume on þa lare þære munuclicre drohtnunge, oðe mynstres þincg forwyrþan for abbudleaste. [10] Se bisceop ([. . .]) þe ðær on neawiste beo, be ure apostolicre <u>leafe and</u> ealdor<dome> ([. . .]) ræd þærto þæt þær abbud wyrþe. <u>Nu ge gebro<þru,</u> þa>s þincg synd þus gelogud gyf ænig bisceop si, oþþe mæssepreost oþþe æniges gehadudes oþþe læwedes na si he na swa rice, þæt gyf he understande þas þincg to awendenne oþþe geþristlæce to abreccenne þe her sind under Godes dome

---

^{y} hi<s> <h>us] hi þus L, E

^{z} þær] þæt L, E

^{aa} cyricli<c>re] cyriclire L, E

^{bb} þinga] þincga E

^{cc} furþon] furþ on E

^{dd} ealle] eall E

^{ee} <he beo>] hi beo([. . .]) L, E

^{ff} lyre] lure E

and sanctus Petrus and uru eac gesette, wite he hine scyldigne ætforan[gg]
Godes gesihþe and framascyrudne fram gemænnysse þæs halwendes
lichaman and blodes ures drihtnes hælendes Cristes, [11] and gehleote eac
þa genyþerunge ðe Iudas Scarioth ures drihtnes hælendes Cristes belæwend
geearnude, and si he eac fordemed eallswa wæs Annanias and Zafira his wif
fram[hh] sancte Petre, þæra[ii] ap<ostola>[jj] ealdre, and si hi to bealue and to
ecere yrmþe efre geteald and betæht, buton he hit ær hæle and bete. Si æfre
lif and hæl and ece eadignyss þam þe þas ðincg gehealdan and þam þe hi
beodan to healdenne. [12] + Handtacen Eþelredes[kk] Myrcena kyniges +
Handtacen Ines Wessexena cyncges. Ic, Ealdhelm, brohte to Ine, Wessexena
kyncge, and to Æþelræde, Myrcena kyncge, þas priuilegia þæt sind syndrie
freodomas[ll] þe se apostolica papa Sergius awrat to ðæra[mm] apostola mynstre
Petres and Paules, and hi geþwæredon and hi hit swa geendudon þæt swa
hweþer swa hit wære swa sibb swa twyrednys betweonan Saxan and
Myr<cenas> þæt þæt my<nste>r beo([. . .]) on sibbe and þa þe (þ[. . .]).

Textual Notes

[1]

Aldhelm<e> ([. . .]) Mealdumesbyrig] 'Aldelmo abbati'; most likely 'Aldhelm<e
    abbude æt> Mealdumesbyrig'; see also H.

þur<h> ([. . .]) arwyrðum mynstre] 'per uos uenerabili uestro monasterio';
    probably 'þurh eow eowrum arwyrðum mynstre', as suggested by H.

æwfulre drohtnunge ([. . .]), Godes þeowum] 'religiosae conuersationis intuitu
    monachis seruis Dei'; thus probably 'æwfulre drohtnunge munecum, Godes
    þeowum' (H), with the only attested usage of 'æfull'. The position of this
    phrase differs in the Old English and Latin versions.

ða<m>] Suggested by W; also implied by the Latin.

[gg]   ætforan] æt foran E
[hh]   fram] from E
[ii]   þæra] þære E
[jj]   ap<ostola>] (aw[. . .]) E
[kk]   Eþelredes] æþelredes E
[ll]   syndrie freodomas] syndriefreodomas E
[mm]   ðæra] ðære E

([. . .]) frigre are] 'pro libera uiuendi facultate', thus 'for frigre are' (H).

buton ælcum twyn] Punctuated to go with the subsequent, not previous phrase, thus following the punctuation in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood empt. 5, rather than that of William.

beon hi<m> generude] Proposed by W.

[2]

þ([. . .])] Perhaps insert 'þus' or 'þa'.

hyra munucbehat and hyra ([. . .])] 'professionis eorum regula'; insert something like 'regul'; see also H.

þæt hi [. . .] þæt hi] Anacoluthon?

[3]

gelogud æt Meldum] 'established by Meldum'; see discussion above.

on wyrþscipe þæs mæran fulluhteres Iohannis is ([. . .])] Possibly 'on wyrþscipe þæs mæran fulluhteres Iohannis is gehalgud'.

þa<m> ([. . .]d) and ure alysend hælend Crist gemedemude] 'cui Creator et Redemptor noster'; thus perhaps 'þa<m> ure scyppend and ure alysend hælend Crist gemedemude'.

Crist gemedemude (be[. . .]ægan) to gewriþenne and to unbindenne] 'Christus claues ligandi atque soluendi ([. . .]) dignatus est impertire'; possibly emend to 'Crist gemedemude besellan [or begeotan] cægan to gewriþenne and to unbindenne'.

on heofenan ([. . .])] 'in caelo atque in terra'; one of the various attested phrases meaning 'on heaven and on earth' is required here.

we (hab[. . .]rnud) and manegra soþan race gehyred þe to us ([. . .]on)] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood empt. 5 again closer to the Old English than William: 'dispensare didicimus multorum ueridica relatione ad nos peruolante agnouimus'; therefore perhaps 'we habbað leornud and manegra soþan race gehyred þe to us is cumon'.

wissudest and dihtest ([. . .])] Equivalent of 'Deo cooperante' is missing, lack of space in this line notwithstanding.

eowre estfulre eadmodnysse] In the Latin version it seems to be the pope's pious devotion which is referred to, not to that of the addressees.

[6]

eow ([. . .]) ungewemmede] Equivalent of 'custodire' is missing.

þæt clænnyss and sidefulnys eowres lichaman and saule ([. . .]) ætforan Godes eagan] A verb corresponding to 'luceat' seems to be missing here, perhaps 'scin' or a synonym; see also next entry.

þæt se inra mann, þæt is seo saul, (s[. . .])] Another verb seems to be missing, corresponding to 'illustretur', perhaps 'scin' or synonym; see also previous entry.

[7]

to bewerigende and to (g[. . .])] Requires one of the many synonyms for 'bewerian'; compare, for instance, 'gewarian and bewerian', Wulfstan, *The Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical*, ed. by K. Jost, Swiss Studies in English, 47 (Bern: Francke, 1959), pp. 71 and 89.

for þi þe ([. . .]nað) and beon sceal] 'quia ([. . .]) oportet et debetur' (W); insert something like 'gedafenað'.

hi<s> <h>us] Suggested by W.

[9]

halgie <he> buton ælcum scette] The subject seems to be missing, although a neighbouring bishop is implied. Compare William's 'reuerentissimo episcopo qui e uicino est', and see also JE 2144, John VII for Farfa, ed. C. Troya, *Codice diplomatico longobardo*, 5 vols (Naples: [n. pub.], 1852-9), III, 60-65, at 63 for identical phrasing.

of þære ([. . .]g[. . .]g) gegaderunge] 'Holy' or equivalent is missing; compare 'religiosa congregatio', and H.

lyre oððe ([. . .]est)] A synonym for 'lyre' appears to be missing.

[10]

Se bisceop ([. . .])] The missing word corresponds to 'similiter', thus perhaps 'eac', or similar.

Se bisceop ([. . .]) þe ðær on neawiste beo, be ure apostolicre leafe and ealdor ([. . .]) ræd þærto þæt þær abbud wyrþe] Difficult also in Latin. Perhaps 'be ure apostolicre leafe and ealdordome nime ræd', as suggested in H.

[12]

þæt þæt my<nste>r beo([. . .]) on sibbe and þa þe (þ[. . .])] Perhaps 'that the monastery should always be at peace and those who live there', cp. H: 'þæt þæt mynster beo æfre on sibbe and þa þe þær Gode þeowiað', presumably supplied on the basis of William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum*, c. 222.

NOTES

[1]   R. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, 2nd edn (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 97-115; H. Gneuss, 'Englands Bibliotheken im Mittelalter und ihr Untergang', and 'Anglo-Saxon Libraries from the Conversion to the Benedictine Reform', in H. Gneuss, *Books and Libraries in Early England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1996), p. 118 and p. 653 respectively, items I and II; S. Kelly, ed., *Charters of Malmesbury Abbey*, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 11 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 4-10.

[2]   Epistola VI, ed. by R. Ehwald, *Aldhelmi opera*, MGH, AA XV (Berlin: Weidmann, 1919), p. 494, l. 14.

[3]   Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. by B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), V.7.

[4]   N. Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1984), p. 77; W. Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), p. 242.

[5]   Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica*, V.11; Levison, p. 59.

[6]   Bede, *Historia abbatum*, ed. by C. Plummer, *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896), I, 380; Levison, p. 24; P. Wormald, 'Bede and Benedict Biscop', in *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede*, ed. by G. Bonner (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1976), pp. 141-69 (pp. 146-49).

[7]   Brooks, p. 78.

[8]   Catalogued in W. de G. Birch, *Cartularium Saxonicum*, 3 vols (London: Whiting, 1885-99), no. 105; P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII* (Milan: Vita e pensiero, 1971), no. 285; *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, ed. by E. Dekkers and E. Gaar, 3rd edn (Steenbrugge: Brepols, 1995), no. 1740; P. Jaffé and W. Wattenbach, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, ed. by S. Loewenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner and P. Ewald, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Leipzig: Veit, 1885-88), I (henceforth cited as JE or JL), no. 2140.

[9]   G. R. C. Davis, *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain: A Short Catalogue* (London: Longmans, 1958), nos. 641, 644 and 645.

[10]   Cambridge, University Library Kk. 4. 6, fols 269^v-270^r; Thomson, pp. 119-36.

[11]   See William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum*, ed. by M. Winterbottom and R. M. Thomson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming), c. 221 for a new edition of the privilege from which Latin quotations in this article derive, with many thanks for pre-publication access. Previous editions are in Ehwald, pp. 512-14; *Patrologia Latina*, 179, cols 1639-41; *Registrum Malmesburiense*, ed. by J. S. Brewer, and C. T. Martin, Rolls Series, 182-83,

2 vols (London: Longman, 1879-80), I, 343-45, and H. Edwards, 'Two Documents from Aldhelm's Malmesbury', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 59 (1986), 1-19 (pp. 17-19).

[12] N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), no. 181.

[13] H. Edwards, *The Charters of the Early West Saxon Kingdom*, British Archaeological Reports, 198 (Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1988), p. 80.

[14] R. Frank and A. Cameron, *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), no. B.16.15; Ker, no. 181.2. I am presenting a new edition of the Old English text here; for previous editions see H. Edwards, 'Two Documents', pp. 16-17; William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum*, ed. by N. E. S. A. Hamilton, Rolls Series, 52 (London: Longman, 1870), pp. 371-73 n., and Birch no. 106.

[15] Bracketed numbers refer to sections in the text given below, following the subdivision of the Latin text in the forthcoming edition of William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum*.

[16] See Edwards, *Charters*, p. 101.

[17] On the survival rate of early papal originals, see R. L. Poole, *Lectures on the History of the Papal Chancery* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915), pp. 37-38.

[18] Edwards, 'Two Documents' and *Charters*, pp. 100-05. N. Berry, 'St Aldhelm, William of Malmesbury, and the Liberty of Malmesbury Abbey', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 16 (1990), 15-38, (p. 20) adopts a similar view, but suggests William of Malmesbury as the presumptive retranslator.

[19] *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*, 2 vols (Brussels: Bollandists, 1899-1901), no. 256; *Acta Sanctorum*, 3rd edn (Paris: Bollandists, 1863-69), May VI, pp. 84-93, with reference to Sergius's privilege on p. 86. On Faricius, see also M. Lapidge and M. Herren, trans., *Aldhelm: The Prose Works* (Ipswich: Brewer, 1979), pp. 5-9, and M. Winterbottom, 'Faricus of Arezzo's Life of St Aldhelm', in *Latin Learning and English Lore: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature for Michael Lapidge*, ed. by K. O'Brien O'Keeffe and A. Orchard, 2 vols (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2005), I, 109-13.

[20] Winterbottom, 'Faricius of Arezzo's Life', pp. 111-15.

[21] Edwards, 'Two Documents', p. 10 n.

[22] Edwards, 'Two Documents', p. 9 and *Charters*, p. 101; for a similar view, see Berry, p. 20.

[23] D. Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), p. 576, 'less authentic', 'modern historians have dismissed these papal documents far too lightly'; Lapidge and Herren, pp. 10 and 204 n., 'almost certainly spurious', 'patently spurious'.

[24] Summary in T. P. McLaughlin, *Le très ancien droit monastique de l'occident*, Archives de la France monastique, 38 (Paris: Picard, 1935), p. 194 n. 4; Conte, no. 285, siglum indicating 'documento dubbio'; P. Fabre, *Étude sur le Liber Censuum de L'Église Romaine* (Paris:

Thorin, 1892), p. 87 n. 1, and the views cited in the previous footnote, on which see the salutary comment by R. M. Thomson, William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum Volume II: General Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), p. 34.

[25] See the publications cited in the next footnote, and McLaughlin, p. 194; D. Knowles, 'Essays in Monastic History IV: The Growth of Exemption', *The Downside Review*, 50 (1932), 201-31 (pp. 225-28); W. Szaivert, 'Die Entstehung und Entwicklung der Klosterexemtion bis zum Ausgang des 11. Jahrhunderts', *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschungen*, 59 (1951), 265-98; JE 2140.

[26] H. H. Anton, *Studien zu den Klosterprivilegien der Päpste im frühen Mittelalter*, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters, 4 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), pp. 60-61, 67-82, 91, 117 and 'Der Liber Diurnus in angeblichen und verfälschten Papstprivilegien des früheren Mittelalters', *Fälschungen im Mittelalter: Internationaler Kongress der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, München, 16. - 19. September 1986* (Hanover: Hahn, 1988), III, 115-42 (pp. 139-41).

[27] L. Santifaller, 'Die Verwendung des *Liber Diurnus* in den Privilegien der Päpste von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 11. Jahrhunderts', in *Liber Diurnus: Studien und Forschungen von Leo Santifaller*, ed. by H. Zimmermann (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1976), pp. 14-158 (p. 88).

[28] JL 8233; Knowles, 'Essays', pp. 227-28; *Registrum Malmesburiense*, I, 346-48.

[29] William of Malmesbury, *Historia novella*, ed. by E. King (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 70; Knowles, 'Essays', p. 227.

[30] Edwards, *Charters*, pp. 80-81.

[31] On this crux, see Plummer, II, 310-11; P. Sims-Williams, *Religion and Literature in Western England 600-800*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 108-09; Edwards, 'Two Documents', p. 10 and *Charters*, pp. 83, 101-02, 126; A. Watkin, 'The Abbey of Malmesbury', *A History of Wiltshire Vol. 3*, ed. by R. B. Pugh and E. Crittall, The Victoria History of the Counties, ed. by R. B. Pugh (London: Dawson, 1956), pp. 210-31 (pp. 228-31); G. T. Dempsey, 'Aldhelm of Malmesbury and the Irish', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 99C (1999), 1-22, and Thomson, William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum Volume II*, p. 30.

[32] J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, *The Place-Names of Wiltshire*, English Place-Name Society, 16 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939), pp. 47-48.

[33] Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica*, V.18. On onomastic elements in place-names, see M. Gelling, *Signposts to the Past: Place-Names and the History of England* (London: Dent, 1978), pp. 188-90, and J. Blair, 'Anglo-Saxon Minsters: A Topographical Review', *Pastoral Care before the Parish*, ed. by J. Blair and R. Sharpe (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992), pp. 226-66 (p. 234).

[34] Edwards, 'Two Documents', p. 10.

³⁵ See the 'Dictionary of Old English', s. v. 'æt' I.D.8, 'by, through, at', 'in passive constructions where a change of state is described'; compare 'gehæled æt þam halgan apostole', 'healed by the holy apostle', Ælfric, *Lives of Saints*, ed. by W. W. Skeat, EETS, o.s. 76, 82, 94, 114, 2 vols (London: Oxford University Press, 1881-1900), II, 414-15, l. 263, and 'ic æt þe wurde afrefred', *The Paris Psalter and the Meters of Boethius*, ed. by G. P. Krapp, ASPR, 5 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), p. 107.

³⁶ 'Dictionary of Old English', s. v. 'æt', I.D.8; the non-Ælfrician attestation cited there (Tuesday in Rogationtide, J. Bazire and J. Cross, eds, *Eleven Old English Rogationtide Homilies*, 2nd edn, King's College London Medieval Studies, 4 (London: King's College, 1989), pp. 95-99, l. 110) in fact quotes verbatim from Ælfric at this point; see M. Godden, 'Old English Composite Homilies from Winchester', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 4 (1975), 57-65 (pp. 61-62).

³⁷ A Boolean search of the 'Patrologia Latina' and 'Acta Sanctorum' databases for *religios** + *memori** gives some thirty examples from a wide range of authors; in all attestations the phrase seems to refer to a deceased person.

³⁸ Punctuation in London, British Library, Cotton Otho C. i points to the latter.

³⁹ 'Dictionary of Old English', Old English Corpus database; P. H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1968), nos 914, 1047, 1089, 1495.

⁴⁰ For two Ælfrician examples, which I owe to Malcolm Godden, see *Catholic Homilies: The First Series: Text*, ed. by P. Clemoes, EETS, s.s. 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 242, l. 46 and G. E. MacLean, 'Ælfric's Version of Alcuini Interrogationes Sigeuulfi in Genesin', *Anglia*, 7 (1884), 18, l. 175.

⁴¹ Similar omissions (which clearly follow a pattern) are also apparent in section [5] of the Latin version in Cambridge, University Library Kk. 4. 6, perhaps indicating different audiences for the various versions.

⁴² I. Koskenniemi, *Repetitive Word Pairs in Old and Early Middle English Prose*, Annales Universitatis Turkuensis, 107 (Turku: Turun Yliopisto, 1968); D. Bethurum, 'Stylistic Features in the Old English Laws', *Modern Language Review*, 27 (1932), 263-79; S. M. Kuhn, 'Synonyms in the Old English Bede', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 46 (1947), 168-76; A. Orchard, 'Crying Wolf: Oral Style and the *Sermones Lupi*', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 21 (1992), 239-64 and M. P. Richards, 'The Medieval Hagiography of St. Neot', *Analecta Bollandiana*, 99 (1979), 259-78 (pp. 262-63).

⁴³ T. Miller, ed., *The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, EETS, o.s. 95, 96, 110, 111, 2 vols (London: Oxford University Press, 1890-98), II, 448.

⁴⁴ F. Liebermann, ed., *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen* (Berlin: Niemeyer, 1903-16), VI Æthelred 36 and 51; D. Whitelock, ed., *Anglo-Saxon Wills* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930), nos 13 and 20.

[45]   Sawyer no. 779; J. Pope, 'Ælfric and the Old English Version of the Ely Privilege', in *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. by P. Clemoes and K. Hughes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), pp. 85-113. I owe the reference to this interesting parallel to Nicholas Brooks.

[46]   As M. Winterbottom has pointed out (pers. comm.).

[47]   Textual difficulties in the Latin include section [4], whose syntax is seemingly resolved correctly in the Old English, and phrasing where Oxford, Bodleian Library, Wood empt. 5 and William's 'edition' diverge. Plummer, II, 310 explains the Latin 'Meldum'[3] as a corruption of 'Maelduin'.

[48]   See, for instance, J. Bately, 'The Nature of Old English Prose', in *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, ed. by M. Godden and M. Lapidge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 71-87, esp. pp. 75-85.

[49]   Edwards, 'Two Documents', p. 10, *Charters*, p. 101.

[50]   William of Malmesbury, *The Early History of Glastonbury*, ed. and trans. by J. Scott (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1981), p. 106, 'Priuilegia sane pape et regis quia nusquam, nisi anglice, scripta repperi, meo labore transfundam in latinum, quantum intelligo ex sensu sensum'.

[51]   JE 2497; see L. Abrams, *Anglo-Saxon Glastonbury: Church and Endowment* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1996), p. 336.

[52]   Edwards, 'Two Documents', pp. 1, 13, 15.

[53]   See also N. Brooks, *Anglo-Saxon Myths: State and Church 400-1066* (London: Hambledon, 2000), p. 191, and *The Early History*, pp. 185-86.

[54]   On English forgeries, see Levison, pp. 22-33; Anton, 'Der Liber Diurnus'; Brooks, *Anglo-Saxon Myths*, pp. 1-19; Wormald, pp. 146-48; S. E. Kelly, 'Some Forgeries in the Archive of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury', and J. Sayers '"Original", Cartulary and Chronicle: The Case of the Abbey of Evesham', both in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter: Teil IV Diplomatische Fälschungen (II)*, MGH, Schriften 33.4 (Hanover: Hahn, 1988), pp. 347-69 and 371-95.

[55]   I would like to thank Nicholas Brooks, Malcolm Godden, Susan Kelly, Rodney Thomson, Michael Winterbottom, and Patrick Wormald for their helpful comments, as also seminar audiences at the universities of York and Birmingham, the CUNY Graduate Center and All Souls College, Oxford.

[56]   Listed in note 14.